

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Robin D. Camlin,)	Civil Action No.: 4:14-cv-03388-RBH
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
South Carolina Department of)	
Natural Resources,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Plaintiff Robin D. Camlin has filed this employment action against Defendant South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, alleging Defendant violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, by discriminating against her on the basis of gender. *See* ECF No. 1-1. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R & R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Kaymani D. West, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.¹ *See* R & R, ECF No. 71. The Magistrate Judge recommends the Court grant Defendant’s motion for summary judgment and end this action. R & R at 1, 38.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court must conduct a de novo review of those portions of the R & R to which specific objections are made, and it may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the R & R. In the absence of objections to the R & R, the

¹ The R & R sets forth in detail the relevant facts and legal standards for this case.

Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the Magistrate Judge's recommendations. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error and therefore adopts and incorporates by reference the R & R [ECF No. 71] of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Defendant's motion for summary judgment and **DISMISSES** this action *with prejudice*.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Florence, South Carolina
June 6, 2016

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge